REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims:

Claims 40 and 48-54 have been canceled. Claims 38 and 39 have each been amended to add the term, "anvil." This amendment is supported at least by claims 8, 9, 41, and 42-47, each of which originally contained the term, "anvil."

Claim 41 has been amended to be put into independent form and to include the limitations of claim 40 from which claim 41 previously depended.

Claims 43, 44 and 46 have each been amended to change the dependencies of those claims from claim 40 to claim 41.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Each of claims 38, 39, and 48-54 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the examiner states that claims 38, 39 and 48 recite the limitation "the path" and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because previously two paths have been set forth (i.e. a media path and a path substantially transverse).

The applicant has hereby amended each of claims 38 and 39 to indicate "anvil path" which is distinguished from "media path." The applicants believe that these amendments overcome the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 48-54 have been canceled, and the rejections of those claims is therefore moot.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Each of claims 40, 43, 46 and 47 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagano (US 5,921,906), and each of claims 48-54 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Belanger (US 6,604,444).

Application No.: 10/764,767 Attorney Docket No.: 10012147-4 Response/Amendment

1

3

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

6

10

25

Claims 43, 46 and 47 now depend from claim 41. Claim 41 is indicated as being allowable. Therefore, each of claims 43, 46 and 47 is also now allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of each of claims 43, 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 40 and 48-54 have been canceled, and the rejections of those claims are therefore moot.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Each of claims 44 and 45 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, as being obvious over Nagano.

Claims 44 and 45 now depend from claim 41, which is indicated as being allowable. Therefore, each of claims 44 and 45 is also now allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of each of claims 44 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Examiner has indicated that claims 8, 9, and 11 are allowed, and that claims 38 and 39 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. The examiner has also indicated that claims 41 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant has amended each of claims 38 and 39 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as indicated herein above. Accordingly, the applicant believes that claims 38 and 39 are now in allowable form.

The applicant has amended claim 41 to be in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 40). Claim 42 depends from claim 41. Accordingly, the applicant believes that claims 41 and 42 are now in allowable form.

SUMMARY

The applicant believes that this communication constitutes a complete response to the office action mailed 03/14/2006. The applicant requests that the claim amendments contained herein be entered because those amendments place the case in condition for allowance, and/or because those amendments comply with the examiner's objections and/or requirements as to form. The applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 8, 9, 11, 38, 39 and 41-47 for at least the reasons set forth herein above.

> Respectfully submitted, Roland Boss, Applicant

by Thomas Olson

Attorney and agent for Applicant

Reg. No. 44,271

Phone: (509) 327-4748

Application No.: 10/764,767 Attorney Docket No.: 10012147-4 Response/Amendment

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

Date: May 01, 2005

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25